



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,161	07/19/2002	Amitai Mor	2786-0205P	7894
2292 73	590 08/11/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			MARTINELL, JAMES	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, A
Be
Q.
~
Y

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/049,161	MOR, AMITAI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
James Martinell	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed

after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply an Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of thi earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is	s non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance exce	ept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte	Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from	consideration.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23,25-31 and 33</u> is/are rejected.	
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24,32 and 34</u> is/are objected to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election	n requirement.
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 2/8/02 is/are: a) accepted or	b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s	·
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is req	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have b	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have b	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docu	
application from the International Bureau (PCT F	` ''
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the ce	ertilled copies not received.
Attachment(s)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/8/02 & 5/28/02.

6) U Other:	Other:
-------------	--------

Art Unit: 1631

Innis et al has not been considered because no copy of the reference is in the USPTO file. The remaining references crossed out on form PTO-1449 filed February 8, 2002 are duplicate entries with the form PTO-1449 filed May 28, 2002

Claims 12 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities..

- (a) Claim 12 ends with a double period.
- (b) In claim 20, in the section describing "e", "us" should be changed to "is". Appropriate correction is required.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: There is no numeral 4 in Figure 2 (see the specification at page 33, line 1). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: The specification does not mention 10a or 10c (see Figure 2). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

Art Unit: 1631

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claims 24, 32, and 34 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8-12, 17, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are vague, indefinite, and incomplete.

- (a) The recitation of "less than about" (claims 8-11) is vague and indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term are not clear. For example, 10 is "about" 8 and 9 is less than 10, but it does not make sense that 9 is less than 8.
- (b) The recitation of "essentially equal" (claim 11) is vague and indefinite because the application makes no distinction between essentially equal and non-essentially equal or essentially non-equal.
- (c) The recitation of "small fraction" (claim 12) is vague, indefinite, and incomplete because the instant application does not delineate a small fraction from a large fraction. The term is a comparative one with no frame of reference.
- (d) The recitation of "is expected to be expressed" (claim 12) is vague and indefinite because the instant application does not define how the expectation is arrived at. The instant application does not distinguish between target oligonucleotides

expected to be expressed and target oligonucleotides expected not to be expressed.

- (e) The recitation of "scarce vector"(claim 12) is vague and indefinite because the instant application does not define the term and there is no art-accepted meaning for the term.
- (f) The recitation of "determined by theoretical considerations" (claim 17) is vague and indefinite. First, the method of determination is undefined. Second, the instant application does not distinguish between theoretical considerations and non-theoretical considerations.
- (g) The recitation of "based on" (claim 17) is vague and indefinite because it is not understood what is meant by the term and the term is not defined in the application.
- (h) The recitation of "expected hybridization affinity" (claim 17) is vague and indefinite because the instant application does not define what is meant by the term.
- (i) The recitation of "optimization model" (claim 19) is vague and indefinite because the term is not defined.
- (j) The recitation of "sparse vector" (claims 21 and 27) is vague and indefinite because the instant application does not define the term and there is no artaccepted meaning for the term.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1631

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-23, 25-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and (e) as being clearly anticipated by either one of Chen et al (J. Biomedical Optics 2(4), 364 (1997)) or Lockhart et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,316). The claims are drawn to oligonucleotide arrays, methods for designing arrays, and methods and systems for determining the relative abundance of target oligonucleotides. Chen et al teaches and describes what is claimed. For example, see the Abstract, Sections 3-5, Figure 1, and Section 8). Likewise, Lockhart et al teaches and describes the claimed invention. For example, see the Abstract and especially Example 1 (columns 67-73).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Martinell whose telephone number is (571) 272-0719. The fax phone number for Examiner Martinell's desktop workstation is (571) 273-0719. The examiner works a flexible schedule and can be reached by phone and voice mail. Alternatively, a request for a return telephone call may be e-mailed to james.martinell@uspto.gov. Since e-mail communications may not be secure, it is suggested that information in such requests be limited to name, phone number, and the best time to return the call.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

PLEASE NOTE THE NEW FAX NUMBER

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Art Unit: 1631

Page 6

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

James Martinell, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1631